DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 149 UD 011 856

AUTHOR Rollins, Howard

TITLE Evaluation of the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Project, Summer 1970, Funded Under ESEA Title I, P.L. 89-10. Research and Development Report, Volume IV, Number 10.

INSTITUTION Atlanta Public Schools, Ga.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; *Educational Attitudes; Low Achievement Factors; *Low Achievers; Negro Students; School Attitudes; Student Attitudes; *Tutorial Programs; *Tutoring
IDENTIFIERS *Atlanta Public Schools; Elementary Secondary Education Title I; ESEA Title I; Georgia

ABSTRACT

One of the main purposes of the program reported herein was to reduce the academic and attitudinal problems of the underachieving high school pupils and to give them the responsibility for producing similar changes in the elementary pupils. The purpose of this evaluation was to determine to what extent the program had been successful. Because of the brief tutoring interval, the detection of changes in pupil behavior was minimized. However, the program did succeed in producing some significant, but rather small changes in the participating pupils. The attitudes of both tutors and tutees were modified in a moderate but positive direction relative to control pupils. (Author)

ED055149

R E S E A R C H A N D D E V E L O P M E N T R E P O R T

Vol. IV, No. 10 Summer, 1970

EVALUATION OF THE YOUTH-TUTORING-YOUTH PROJECT

SUMMER, 1970

Funded Under ESEA Title I, P.L. 89-10

Prepared by
Dr. Howard Rollins
Assistant Professor of Psychology and Education
Emory University

and

Dr. Jarvis Barnes
Assistant Superintendent
for Research and Development

Dr. John W. Letson
Superintendent

Atlanta Public Schools
224 Central Avenue, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 011856

PREFACE

During the summer of 1970 a program entitled Youth-Tutoring-Youth was funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), Title I (summer appropriations), for the Atlanta Public Schools. The evaluation of the project was subcontracted to Dr. Howard Rollins, Assistant Professor of Education and Psychology, Emory University. Dr. Rollins was assisted by Richard Tucker and Alan Goldman.

One of the main purposes of the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program was to reduce the academic and attitudinal problems of the underachieving high school pupils and to give them the responsibility for producing similar changes in the elementary pupils.

Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation was to determine to what extent the program had been successful. The results and recommendations should be valuable in designing a program of this type for the future.

Jarvis Barnes
Assistant Superintendent
for Research and Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PROJECT OBJECTIVES	1
THE BASIC PLAN	2
EVALUATION	
Tutors	4
Tutees	5
Description of Centers Evaluated	8
EVALUATION RESULTS	
Effects of the Tutoring Experience on Tutors	11
Effects of Tutoring Project on Tutees	20
General Summary	26
EVALUATION OF PROGRAM BY PROJECT STAFF AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL	28
EVALUATION OF PROGRAM BY TUTORS	30
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30
COST FOR EDUCATIONAL AIDES IN PROGRAM	34
REFERENCES	35
APPENDIX	
About Myself Scale	38
Crandall's Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire	39
Fitt's School Attitude Test	43
Newman Reading Analysis	45
Evaluation Form for Principals, Teachers, and Group Leaders	47
Evaluation Form for Tutors	48

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
1	LIST OF SCHOOLS, CENTER LEADERS, AND NUMBER OF TUTORS	3
2	LIST OF TESTS, TEST ADMINISTRATORS, AND OBJECTIVES ASSESSED FOR TUTORS AND TUTEES	6
3	MEAN PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES AND AMOUNT OF GAIN (LOSS) FOR EACH ITEM OF THE ALL ABOUT MYSELF SCALE	13
4	MEAN PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES AND AMOUNT OF GAIN (LOSS) FOR PROJECT-RELATED AND UNRELATED ITEMS LISTED BY SCHOOL WITH SUMMARY TOTALS FOR MALES AND FEMALES	14
5	MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR FOR TUTORS AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS	16
6	MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES FOR TUTORS AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS	18
7	MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN SCHOOL ATTITUDE SCORES FOR TUTORS AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS	19
8	MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SEX	21
9	MEAN GAIN (LOSS) INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS	21
10	MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SEX	22
11	MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS	24
12	MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN SCHOOL ATTITUDE SCORES FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SEX	24
13	MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN SCHOOL ATTITUDE SCORES FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS	25

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
14	MEAN PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES (IN GRADE EQUIVALANTS) FOR TUTEES ON THE READING SUBJECT OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST	27
15	MEAN SCALE VALUES OF EVALUATION ITEMS FOR TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND CENTER LEADERS	29
16	TUTORS' EVALUATION OF PROGRAM	31

I. INTRODUCTION

The Coleman Report among others has shown quite clearly that the black child, particularly in urban areas of the Southeast, is less well prepared for the educational experiences of the public school than his white suburban peer and that this educational gap widens considerably through the elementary and secondary school years. The end results of this increasing difference in achievement are high drop-out rates in black, urban high schools, pupils graduating from these high schools achieving well below grade level, and a much lower percentage of this population going beyond the high school diploma for advanced training. While a number of Federal programs have been implemented to counteract this pattern among preschool (for example, Headstart, Parent-Child Centers) and primary (for example, Follow Through) age children, the problems in the high schools have been largely neglected, except in more narrowly focused programs like Upward Bound.

This report is an evaluation of a program implemented during the summer of 1970 in the Atlanta Public Schools. It was designated to reduce the academic and attitudinal problems of the underachieving high school pupil. Underachieving, urban, and predominantly black high school pupils were hired to tutor mostly 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade pupils in nearby elementary schools. The major emphasis of the tutorial sessions was language-arts. The overall objectives of the project were two-fold: (1) to improve the academic background, self-concept, and school attitudes of each tutor by giving him the responsibility for producing similar changes in underachieving tutees; and (2) to provide underachieving 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade children with individualized instruction in language arts through an instructor who has recently experienced the same problems and, therefore, may have a greater understanding of the child and how he should be taught.

II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The rationale for the project is simple and straightforward. The underachieving high school pupil has experienced a long series of failures in the school setting. Frequently he is a poor reader, a discipline problem, and a truancy problem. School for many of these pupils has become an unpleasant, embarassing, nonsatisfying experience, and one over which the pupil has

little control. The Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program was designed to counteract some of these symptoms by giving the pupil responsibility for a task which he can do well, one in which he might discover that he had learned something in the years since he was the age of his tutee, and one which permits him to use the insights his experiences have given him to teach an elementray child. Finally, this experience may show him that school can be a pleasant and highly rewarding environment.

A program like the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program should also be a profitable experience for the elementary children involved. In this program underachieving elementary children recieve the individualized help they require but which the school system cannot normally provide; and this educational experience comes from an individual with a background and set of experiences similar to the tutee. The project staff, therefore, predicted that the self-concept, school attitudes, and achievement of tutees would also improve as a result of the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program.

III. THE BASIC PLAN

The basic plan of the project was to set up Tutoring Centers in selected urban elementary schools. Each center consisted of an educational aide, approximately ten tutors, and twenty to thirty tutees selected from summer school classes underway in the school. The educational aides participated in a brief, two-day workshop (June 17-18) coordinated by Mrs. Mamie P. Thomas, Lead Teacher at C. M. Pitts Elementary School; with Miss Ann Wright, Coordinator of Elementary Education; and Otis White, Director of Title I, as consultants. Fifteen elementary schools were selected and agreed to participate in the project. A list of these schools, the educational aide in charge of the center at each school, and the number of tutors participating at each school are presented in Table 1. As indicated in Table 1, C. M. Pitts School supported two Tutoring Centers; all other schools had only one center.

Tutors were to be selected from secondary pupils participating in the Neighborhood Youth Corp Program who showed evidence of underachievement. However, as a result of the small number of tutors present for the first few days of the summer program, these criteria were relaxed in order to supply each center with as many tutors as possible. A total of approximately 150 tutors and over 300 tutees eventually participated in the project.

TABLE 1

LIST OF SCHOOLS, CENTER LEADERS, AND NUMBER OF TUTORS

Name of School	Name of Educational Aide	Number of Tutors
Capitol Avenue	Miss Tommie Howard	10
E. R. Carter	Mrs. Ruth R. Wall	9
English Avenue	Mrs. Ruth Jennings	10
C. L. Gideons	Mrs. Carolyn B. Starr	8
Gilbert	Mrs. Nellie Phillips	7
Goldsmith	Mrs. Claudette Miller	8
Grant Park	Mrs. Louise Smith	10
C. W. Hill	Mrs. Velma L. Rowe	9
C. D. Hubert	Mrs. Minnie Coleman	7
C. M. Pitts*	Mrs. Aldora Landrum	10
C. M. Pitts*	Mrs. Cora Bennett	10
T. H. Slater	Mrs. Jaunita L. Williams	8
W. F. Slaton	Mrs. Viola Simmons	9
Toomer	Mrs. Josephine Wilder	10
E. A. Ware	Mrs. Johnnie Bussey	10
Wesley Avenue	Mrs. Ethel H. Johnson	10
		145

*C. M. Pitts supported two Tutoring Centers.

As noted previously, the major content of the tutoring sessions was language-arts. Center leaders and tutors were given training in the use of Dr. Robert E. Newman's Reading Analysis Program which emphasizes the basic skills in reading. The Center leaders and tutors were also given training in the use of the Spache Reading Diagnostic Test. Tutors were encouraged to create their own tutoring methods with an emphasis on the game approach to learning and the use of language, writing, and reading as an effective means of expression. Tutors were trained by each center leader during the first week of the summer program and prior to the selection and participation of tutees. Tutor training was similar to the training received by center leaders.

The tutoring program was center and school-oriented with a flexibility which allowed each center and school to make independent decisions about the details of the tutoring sessions. As a result of this flexibility, several atypical centers evolved through the course of the summer and it was difficult to be precise about the details of daily tutoring sessions. Usually, a tutor would work with one or two tutees for approximately one hour followed by another session with one or two additional tutees. Thus, each tutor spent one hour per school day for four to five weeks with each tutee and tutored up to four tutees during any given day. Tutors were given considerable time (up to two hours) to prepare a new curriculum for the next day's session and to evaluate the experiences of their present day.

IV. EVALUATION

The evaluation team met with the Project Director in June to determine the major objectives of the project and how best to assess the success of the project with respect to these objectives. The following objectives were agreed upon at that time:

Tutors

As a result of participation of each tutor, the high school pupil would: (1) gain insight into, and understanding of, himself and these changes in self-concept would occur predominantly with respect to the child's school-related abilities and to self-confidence in his ability to accomplish academic tasks; (2) more readily accept responsibility for the consequences of his actions and as a result of being a successful tutor, he should be more likely to

accept credit for positive events happening and blame for negative consequences of his behavior, particularly for school-related behaviors; (3) develop a more positive attitude toward school and school-related tasks; and (4) show a significant increase in reading achievement.

Tutees

As a result of his participation, each tutee would: (1) more readily accept credit for academic successes and blame for academic failures, (2) develop a more positive attitude toward school and school-related tasks, and (3) show significant gains in reading achievement.

In order to evaluate each of these objectives, standardized paper and pencil tests were administered to the tutors and tutees both at the beginning and end of the project interval. Because of the distances between schools and the shortage of time and personnel, it was impossible to collect these data on all schools participating in the project. For these reasons, six schools were randomly chosen for extensive evaluation. The selected schools were: (1) C. D. Hubert School, (2) C. M. Pitts School, (3) Toomer School, (4) Grant Park School, (5) E. R. Carter School, and (6) Slater School.

Both tutor and tutee control pupils were also tested. Tutor controls were selected from summer school classes at Coan Middle School and Booker T. Washington High School. Tutor controls selected from Booker T. Washington were Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) enrollees involved in more traditional NYC tasks. Tutee controls were selected from summer classes at each of the six participating elementary schools. In all, 56 tutors, 72 tutor controls, 78 tutees, and 91 tutee controls were tested both before and after the 4-5 weeks of tutoring.

Table 2 presents a list of the tests administered to each tutor and tutee along with the personnel who administered the test and the objective assessed. Copies of nonstandardized tests are included in the Appendix. As indicated in Table 2, reading achievement data were collected on tutors by the center leaders using the Newman Analysis Test and the Spache Reading Diagnostic Test. These data are not included in the present report since (1) the evaluation team discovered that pretest and posttest scores were not available for many tutors (2) available tests frequently indicated that tutors obtained near maximum scores on the pre-project administration of the test, and (3) there were wide variations in the administration of the tests among center leaders. No other reading achievement data were available on

TABLE 2

LIST OF TESTS, TESE ADMINISTRATORS, AND OBJECTIVES ASSED FOR TUTORS AND TUTEES

	Objectives Measured		
Name of Test	Tutors	Tutees	Administrator
All About Myself Scale	1	(not given)	Project Personnel
Crandall's Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire	2	1	Evaluation team
Fitt's School Attitude Scale	3	2	Evaluation team
Reading Subtest of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (Elementary, Form B for 4th grade Intermediate, Form AM for 5th grade)	(not given)	3	Evaluation team
Newman Reading Analysis	4		Project personnel
Spache Reading Diagnostic	4		Project personnel

tutors so that the fourth objective, of showing a significant increase in reading achievement, for tutors could not be evaluated.

Two of the tests administered to tutees and tutors and a third test administered to tutors have not been widely used. For this reason, a brief description of each of these tests follows:

A. Fitt's School Attitude Scale

A. B. Fitt (1956) developed a scale to assess a child's attitude toward school by presenting 33 statements displaying varying degrees of favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward school. The child was asked to indicate his agreement with each statement by marking either "yes" or "no". Each statement was assigned a scale value varying from 1 (corresponding to extreme liking) to 11 (corresponding to extreme disliking) of school. The scale values for all statements with which a child agreed were summed and a mean scale value determined. Thus, the lower a child's score, the more positive was his attitude toward school. In his original application of the scale, Fitt's found that girls liked school more than boys, that primary age children liked school more than high school age children and that lower socio-economic level children (mean scale value 4.7) liked school less than high socio-economic level children (mean scale 3.9).

B. Crandall's Intellectual Achievement Responsibility Questionnaire

This test was developed by Crandall (1957) to assess the degree to which a child is willing to accept internal, personal responsibility for the consequences of his academic behavior as opposed to blaming others, fate, or luck for things which happen to him. The test has two scales with 17 questions per scale; one to assess acceptance of responsibility for positive consequences of academic behavior, the other assess acceptance of blame for negative consequences of academic behavior. The scores on each scale were obtained by summing those questions out of the total of seventeen for which the child indicated he would take personal responsibility. Thus, the scores could range from 0 to 17 with higher scores representing acceptance of more responsibility. Sample questions are not included here since the entire test is included in the Appendix.

C. All About Myself Scale

The project staff administered the All About Myself Scale to each tutor both before and after the tutoring experience. On this test the child rates himself on sixteen areas of competence by circling one of five points on a scale ranging from 1 - very little ability to 5 - very great ability. This test appears to measure the child's attitudes about his own strength in certain academic (for example, written expression) and non-academic areas such as physical health, artistic ability, and the like. Since the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Project was designed particularly to change the tutor's self-concept in areas specifically related to the school environment, the All About Myself Scale data were analyzed by dividing the 16 questions into those dealing with academic and self-worth abilities and those dealing with non-academic abilities. The All About Myself Scale was administered to all tutors participating in the project but was not given to any controls.

Description of Centers Evaluated

There were several variations in project procedure across the six schools, receiving extensive evaluation. The differences involved age of tutee and tutor, types of materials available and used, and the format of the tutoring sessions. Since some of these variations may have affected the outcome of the project, the procedure followed at each school is briefly described.

A. C. D. Hubert School

The Hubert School program operated according to the program guidelines with a tutoring center and individualized tutoring. Tutoring was concentrated on the basic communication skills within a gameplaying framework. The tutors spent much of their time developing their own curriculum materials. They were under the direct supervision of the center leader at all times with the center leader serving as liaison with the teachers. Tutoring was limited to the intermediate grades comprising combined grades three, four, and five with the majority of tutees being rising third and fourth graders. Tutors were rising ninth grade pupils and four of the seven had tutored during that spring at Hubert School.

B. E. R. Carter

The Carter School program was unique in that it was the only program where tutors worked entirely within the summer school classroom rather than at a centrally located tutoring center. In effect, the nine tutors were under the direct supervision of the classroom teacher rather than the center leader. Tutors at this school were thus given less responsibility for developing curriculum and more knowledgeable guidance with the tutees. The tutors met at the end of each day for purposes of summary and evaluation. Classes in which the tutor-teacher aide participated ranged from prekindergarten to grade five, with one tutor serving as an aide to the librarian and thus really did not work directly with a tutee. Tutee evaluation was concentrated on grades four and five. Tutors working with prekindergarten children remained in the same class all day while tutors in the higher grades changed classes. The tutors at Carter School were rising 10th and 11th graders.

C. Grant Park Community School

Because Grant Park School is a cummunity school, the summer classes there were non-academic. Thus, the 10 tutors assigned to Grant Park School worked within the framework of such special interest groups as sewing, art, music, and typing. Tutors worked in activity locations rather than a central tutoring center sometimes under the supervision of an activity leader and sometimes conducting the special interest groups themselves. Since all activities were voluntary, pupil attendance was irregular, and consistent individualized tutoring was impractical. (That is, a tutor worked with any child who needed help and often went from class to class each day.) This factor also made it impractical to evaluate tutee performance in any systematic way, for it was impossible to identify all the tutees. The center leader coordinated all activities working closely with the school director, and the tutors met daily for planning and evaluation. Tutors were rising 10th, 11th, and 12th graders.

D. Pitt's School

The program at Pitt's School followed the program outline. The twenty tutors were mostly 9th and 10th graders from Archer High School with the tutees concentrated in 4th and 5th grades. Several of the

tutors participated in a tutoring project during the previous school year. The content of the tutoring sessions included arithmetic drills, spelling drills, original writing, and the teaching of some reading skills. Many of the tutors created their own materials in the form of various learning games.

E. Slater School

The Slater program also followed the program guidelines closely. The 10 tutors ranged from 8th to 11th grade level with the tutees concentrated in 3rd and 4th grades. The program at this school was more structured than others and seemed to have a better supply of commercial reading materials such as flash cards and tape recorders. Although some time was spent teaching math skills, the majority of the tutoring time was used for the teaching of reading skills such as word attack, comprehension, and vocabulary. Tutors at this school relied more on commercial materials than on materials, such as handmade games.

F. Toomer School

The program at Toomer School followed program guidelines with a central tutoring center under the supervision of the center leader. The tutors were 8th graders from Coan Middle School and the tutees were concentrated in the 3rd and 4th grades. As with the Slater commercial reading materials such as reading skills games, flash cards, and tape recorders. Tutors often used these materials rather than creating their own.

V. EVALUATION RESULTS

The test data for tutees and their controls and for tutors and their controls were examined separately by analysis of covariance on the mean gain (loss) from pretest to posttest with the pretest scores as the covariant. For each test employed there was significant correlation between the initial score of given pupil, both tutor and tutee, and the gain (loss) from initial to post score. Typically, pupils scoring high initially showed little or no gains and in many cases showed a loss across the pretest,posttest interval. On the other hand, pupils receiving low initial scores tended to show moderate to high gains across the pretest, posttest interval. Because of this

correlation, the median pretest score for each test was used to divide the tutors and tutees into two groups, and gains (losses) are presented separately for those scoring above and below the median. It is not clear how to interpret the data for pupils scoring above the median on a pretest since their gain (loss) may be affected by the degree to which their scores approach the maximum score for a test. Thus, the outcome of the tutor-tutee treatment for pupils scoring above the median could be lessened since these children have less distance to move before reaching a maximum for the test. Alternatively, one could argue that pupils scoring high initially on a test do not improve or even lose when placed in the tutor-tutee treatment. That is, pupils who already do well in school-related areas many suffer when taken away from the classroom for tutorial help. Therefore, the data for tutors and tutees scoring above and below the median are presented and discussed separately.

Two other problems arose with respect to the evaluation of this project. First, there was an extremely high drop-out rate near the end of the summer quarter. In some schools as many as 50% of the tutees did not continue through the last week of the project. Thus, even though posttesting began in the middle of the 5th week of the Summer Session, posttest scores were not available for many tutees. This reduced the size of the sample evaluated.

Second, the interval between pretest and posttest was very short, ranging from a maximum of 5 weeks to the more usual 4 week interval. The main causes of the shortness of the interval were delays in obtaining tutors and selecting tutees initially and the need to begin posttesting before the last week of the session due to the high attrition rate. Because of the brevity of the treatment interval, it is possible that many of the possible effects of the tutoring sessions were effective but too small to reach significant proportions. The evaluators have, therefore, noted changes in tutor and tutee behavior which are moves in the predicted direction even when the changes are small and statistically non-significant.

Effects of the Tutoring Experience on Tutors

A. All About Myself Scale (AAMS)

One of the more important objectives of the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program was to improve the secondary pupil's attitudes about his own abilities. In particular, the project staff anticipated an improvement in the pupil's confidence in academic and self-worth areas.

The All About Myself Scale was given as the pretest and posttest to all tutors participating in the project in order to assess this objective.

The AAMS items, their mean pretest and posttest scale values, and the resulting gain (loss) scores are displayed in Table 3, with separate columns for male and female tutors. Inspection of Table 3 indicates that, on the whole, tutors rated themselves as above average (scale value of 3) on all items; the only exception being the understandably low rating that females assigned to their "mechanical ability". In addition, tutors showed small to moderate gains on almost every item.

However, there were differences in the degree of gain in confidence across the 16 areas assessed. Based upon the objectives stated previously and the nature of the tutoring program, the 16 ability areas were grouped according to the criterion of their relatedness to the tutoring program. Items 1-5, 11, 12, 14, and 16 all appear to be directly related to the following objectives of the project: improving attitudes toward the education experience (3, 4, 5, 14); increasing individual responsibility (1, 2); and improving self concept (11, 12, 16). The other 7 items appear to be related to abilities which would not be affected by this program and can, in fact, serve as a form of control category against which to compare gains on related items. The data were grouped and reanalyzed by gain score according to these criteria.

Table 4 lists the gain (loss) scores according to the "related" vs. "unrelated" categories for each school and includes a summary of these data summed over schools for both male and female tutors. One can see that tutors showed larger gains (mean gain = 0.21) on related items than unrelated ones (mean gain = 0.09). This difference was analyzed by a Mann Whitney U. Test and found to be significant, $U(7,9)=13.5$, $p < .10$. A comparison of male and female tutors suggests that this effect is much more pronounced for males than females. The Mann Whithey Test indicated that males gained significantly in related areas, $U = 7.5$, $p < .05$, while females did not.

Greater gains were made on related than unrelated items for all participating schools except Gilbert, Wesley, and Pitts. The fact that Gilbert School had no male tutors may account for the

TABLE 3

MEAN PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES AND AMOUNT OF GAIN (LOSS) FOR EACH ITEM OF THE ALL ABOUT MYSELF SCALE

Items	Males N = 38			Females N = 84			Total N = 122		
	Pre-test	Post-test	Gain	Pre-test	Post-test	Gain	Pre-test	Post-test	Gain
1. To be a leader	3.26	3.76	+.50	3.54	3.73	+.19	3.45	3.74	+.29
2. To work on my own	3.79	4.34	+.55	3.94	4.13	+.19	3.89	4.20	+.31
3. To speak before the class	3.03	3.71	+.68	3.40	3.65	+.25	3.28	3.67	+.39
4. To express ideas in writing	3.55	4.03	+.48	3.68	3.67	-.01	3.64	3.78	+.14
5. To think clearly	3.76	4.11	+.35	3.62	3.74	+.12	3.66	3.85	+.19
6. My artistic ability	3.30	3.51	+.21	3.02	3.25	+.23	3.11	3.33	+.22
7. My athletic ability	3.89	4.16	+.27	3.36	3.35	-.01	3.53	3.60	+.07
8. My musical ability	3.29	3.47	+.18	3.37	3.44	+.07	3.34	3.45	+.11
9. My acting ability	3.61	3.79	+.18	3.29	3.25	-.04	3.39	3.42	+.03
10. My mechanical ability	3.26	3.39	+.13	2.63	2.75	+.02	2.83	2.95	+.12
11. My ability to get along with others	4.29	4.58	+.29	4.25	4.25	.00	4.26	4.36	+.10
12. My self-confidence	4.11	4.34	+.23	3.80	4.11	+.31	3.89	4.11	+.22
13. My appearance	3.92	4.05	+.13	3.77	3.94	+.17	3.82	3.98	+.16
14. My eagerness to learn	4.11	4.24	+.13	4.05	4.08	+.03	4.07	4.13	+.06
15 My physical health	4.37	4.42	+.05	4.20	4.08	-.12	4.26	4.19	-.07
16. My imagination	4.00	4.21	+.21	3.86	4.05	+.19	3.90	4.10	+.20

TABLE 4

MEAN PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES AND AMOUNT OF GAIN (LOSS) FOR PROJECT-RELATED AND UNRELATED ITEMS LISTED BY SCHOOL WITH SUMMARY TOTALS FOR MALES AND FEMALES

		Items Related to Project Objectives (Items 1,2,3,4, 5,11,12,14,16)				Items Unrelated to Project Objectives (Items 6,7,8,9,10,13,15)			
Schools	N	Pre	Post	Gain	(Loss)	Pre	Post	Gain	(Loss)
Carter	9	3.72	4.00	.28		3.16	3.21	.05	
English Avenue	10	3.57	3.82	.25		3.39	3.50	.11	
Gideons	7	3.71	4.30	.59		3.47	3.76	.29	
Gilbert	7	3.65	3.48		(.17)	3.20	3.14		(.06)
Goldsmith	8	3.92	4.25	.33		3.63	3.88	.25	
Grant Park	5	3.47	3.93	.46		3.20	3.49	.29	
Hill	9	3.56	3.96	.40		3.30	3.57	.27	
Hubert	7	4.11	4.21	.10		3.90	3.73		(.17)
Pitts	17	4.17	4.10		(.07)	3.89	3.71		(.18)
Slater	7	3.64	3.97	.33		3.40	3.44	.04	
Slaton	7	3.95	4.13	.18		3.73	3.78	.05	
Toomer	10	3.84	3.93	.09		3.60	3.56		(.04)
Ware	10	3.49	3.76	.27		3.14	3.34	.20	
Wesley Avenue	10	3.78	3.99	.21		3.17	3.67	.50	
Summary									
Males only	38	3.77	4.15	.38		3.66	3.82	.16	
Females only	84	3.79	3.93	.14		3.38	3.44	.06	
TOTAL	122	3.78	3.99	.21		3.47	3.56	.09	

absence of change there. Wesley School tutors gained on both related and unrelated items with a larger gain for the latter. Pitts School tutors lost confidence over the testing interval although this loss was less for related than for unrelated items.

In summary, then, it appears that most of the tutors recorded greater gains in those areas for which gains would be predicted given effective implementation of the program objectives. Furthermore, it can be concluded that male tutors benefit more from the project than females in terms of changes in attitudes toward themselves.

B. Acceptance of Responsibility for the Consequence of Academic Behavior

The data for the two subscales of the Intellectual Achievement Responsibility (IAR) Questionnaire were scored and analyzed separately. The first scale measures the child's willingness to accept credit for the positive consequences of his academic behavior (for example, he did well on a test because he studied for it). The mean gain (loss) on this scale over the pretest, posttest interval is presented in Table 5 for tutors at each school and for the two control schools. The data are presented separately for children scoring above and below the median on the pretest. The analysis of these data indicated only a marginally significant effect ($F(1,118) = 1.76$, $p < .25$) of the tutoring experience. Inspection of the gain (loss) figures in Table 5 reveals a clear trend towards greater gains for tutors than controls particularly for those tutors who scored below the median on the pretest. In four of the six schools tested, tutors scoring below the median on the pretest gained substantially more than control pupils. Of the tutors scoring initially above the median on this scale, only those at Toomer School lost more ground than the controls. Thus, even though the differences between tutors and controls is not large or statistically significant, the trend of the data indicates some increase in the tutor's acceptance of credit for positive consequences of his behavior. This is particularly true for tutors receiving low scores initially. Further, this result might substantiate other research findings that a tutor who is a below average achiever profits more from tutoring than one who is an average or above average achiever.

TABLE 5

MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR FOR TUTORS AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS

Schools	N	Initial Score Above Median	N	Initial Score Below Median
Participating Schools				
Pitts	6	.33	13	.46
Slater	2	.00	3	2.33
Toomer	3	(.67)	7	.57
Carter	5	(.20)	4	1.25
Hubert	3	.00	3	3.67
Grant Park	0	—	7	2.43
Total	19	(.05)	37	1.35
Control Schools				
Coan	14	(.28)	27	.74
Washington	22	(.23)	9	.89
Total	36	(.25)	36	.78

The other scale included in the IAR Questionnaire assesses the degree to which the pupil accepts responsibility for the negative consequences of his academic behavior (for example, I failed the test because I did not study). Table 6 presents mean gain (losses) for this subscale for tutors by schools and for controls. As the data in Table 6 indicate, there were no distinctive differences between the tutors and their controls in terms of acceptance of blame for negative consequences and no statistically significant results were obtained. The mean initial scores for the tutors and controls respectively were 11.32 and 11.38 while their respective post scores were 11.57 and 11.68 indicating about an equal and slight change for both groups. The scores for both tutor and control schools are highly hetereogeneous with large gains and losses in each case.

C. Fitt's School Attitude Scale

Mean gains (losses) in the tutor and control pupil's attitude towards school are presented in Table 7. As indicated by the table, attitude toward school showed little change for both tutors and their controls over the pretest and posttest interval and the statistical analysis revealed no significant effects. As indicated in the introduction, the school attitude score ranges from 1, indicating a high positive attitude toward school, to 11, indicating a high negative attitude toward school. The average initial scores for tutors and their controls were 3.94 and 4.03 respectively with 3.98 and 3.94 respectively as posttest scores. These scores suggest that both the tutors and their controls tend to be moderately positive toward school. A comparison of the present data with Fitt's norms for high and low socio-economic level children suggests that the high school pupils in depressed Atlanta communities like school more than those economically deprived pupils in Fitt's sample. The median split of these data indicate that pupils who like school initially have less favorable school attitudes at the end of the project interval while pupils who do not like school initially tend to improve in school attitude over the interval. Again this result might substantiate that a below average trait performance might be a criterion for selecting tutors.

TABLE 6

MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES FOR TUTORS AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS

Schools	N	Initial Score Above Median	N	Initial Score Below Median
Participating Schools				
Pitts	7	.57	12	.92
Slater	3	(1.33)	2	1.5
Toomer	5	.60	5	(.40)
Carter	5	.20	4	(1.25)
Hubert	4	(1.5)	2	4.00
Grant Park	3	.33	4	.00
Total	27	(.04)	29	.52
Control Schools				
Coan	22	.36	19	.89
B. T. Washington	16	-.75	15	.60
Total	38	(.11)	34	.76

TABLE 7

MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN SCHOOL ATTITUDE SCORES FOR TUTORS AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS

Schools	N	Initial Score Above Median	N	Initial Score Below Median
Participating Schools				
Pitts	10	(.41)	9	.25
Slater	4	(.02)	1	1.50
Toomer	5	(.04)	5	.11
Carter	2	(.10)	7	.13
Hubert	2	(.81)	4	.50
Grant Park	2	.37	5	.11
Total	25	(.22)	31	.25
Control Schools				
Coan	22	(.37)	18	.05
Washington	19	(.07)	12	.16
Total	41	(.23)	30	.09

Effects Of Tutoring Project On Tutees

A. Acceptance of Responsibility for the Consequences of Academic Behavior

Table 8 presents the mean gain (loss) in internal acceptance of credit for positive consequences of behavior for male and female tutees and their controls. There were two statistically significant effects. The effect of the tutorial experience depended upon the sex of the pupil, $F\ (1,142) = 7.16$, $p < .01$. In addition, the amount gained was a function of schools, $F\ (4, 142) = 2.59$, $p < .05$. As indicated in Table 8, the effect of the tutorial experience on acceptance of credit for academic successes was a function of the sex of the pupil and the level of the initial score. Male tutees and their controls scoring above the median on the pretest tended to accept less responsibility for their actions at the end of the program. However, the male control pupils showed a smaller loss over the test interval. Female tutees and controls scoring above the median initially lost about the same amount over the project interval. On the other hand male tutees scoring below the median initially gained but not nearly as much as male controls while female tutees scoring low initially gained more than the female controls.

The mean gain (loss) scores for this subscale of the IAR Questionnaire are presented for each school in Table 9. The main differences across schools appear to be the consistent gain scores for pupils at Hubert School and the rather consistent losses for pupils at Slater School. Other schools fall in between these two extreme groups.

To summarize, the tutorial experience was beneficial for female tutees but slightly harmful for male tutees. This effect was most pronounced for pupils scoring below the median on the pretest. Thus, female tutees (below the median) were more likely to accept responsibility for academic successes after the program relative to controls while male tutees were less likely to accept this responsibility.

Table 10 presents mean gain (losses) in acceptance of blame for academic failures for male and female tutees and controls. As was

TABLE 8

MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SEX

	Initial Scores Above Median				Initial Scores Below Median			
	Tutees		Controls		Tutees		Controls	
	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)
Males	11	(2.00)	21	(0.95)	19	0.37	12	2.17
Females	28	(0.85)	31	(0.93)	12	1.75	15	0.14
Overall	39	(1.18)	52	(0.94)	31	0.72	27	0.80

TABLE 9

MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS

	Initial Scores Above Median				Initial Scores Below Median			
	Tutees		Controls		Tutees		Controls	
Schools	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)
Pitts	5	(2.20)	9	(2.33)	7	1.43	7	0.00
Slater	5	(1.60)	11	(1.35)	11	(0.55)	4	0.25
Toomer	12	(1.42)	8	(1.13)	6	1.50	10	1.40
Carter	17	(0.58)	19	(0.31)	5	0.00	6	1.00
Hubert	0	--	5	0.40	10	1.50	8	0.88
Overall	39	(1.18)	52	(0.94)	39	0.72	35	0.80

TABLE 10

MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SEX

	Above Median				Below Median			
	Tutees		Controls		Tutees		Controls	
	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)
Males	20	(1.35)	23	(1.13)	15	0.20	12	(0.26)
Females	20	(1.60)	30	(0.13)	23	(0.26)	22	(0.05)
Overall	40	(1.48)	53	(0.57)	38	(0.08)	34	(0.06)

true for tutors, there were no statistically significant effects of the project on this subscale of the IAR Questionnaire. With the exception of male tutees scoring below the median, all groups showed moderate to large losses in willingness to accept blame for academic failures.

There were some large statistically significant discrepancies across schools ($F\ (4,142) = 2.07$, $p < .10$), and so the gains and losses for each school are presented in Table 11. Pupils at Toomer, Carter, and Hubert Schools showed rather consistent losses while pupils at Pitts and Slater Schools who scored below the median initially showed moderate gains.

B. Fitt's School Attitude Scale

The gain or loss in school attitude is presented in Table 12 for male and female tutees and controls. Since higher scores on this test indicate a less favorable attitude toward school, the gains displayed in Table 12 represent a change to a more unfavorable school attitude while losses represent improvement. Two findings reached statistical significance. For the most part, the school attitude of male tutees and controls dropped over the testing interval. Female pupils scoring above the median showed considerable improvement in school attitude and the attitude of those below the median dropped only slightly, $F\ (1,144) = 13.44$, $p < .01$. In addition, the effects of the tutorial program depended upon the sex of the tutee, $F\ (1,144) = 2.75$, $p < .10$. For males, the tutoring experience had a slight beneficial effect; male tutee attitude changes were more favorable than male controls for pupils scoring above and below the median. This does not mean, however, that the attitude of male tutees improved over the project interval but that male tutee attitudes deteriorated less than controls. For females, the tutoring experience was slightly detrimental. For females scoring above the median, tutees improved less than controls whereas for females below the median tutee attitude dropped more than for the controls.

The breakdown of gains and losses in school attitude by schools is presented in Table 13. There were no statistically reliable

TABLE 11

MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN INTERNAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS

	Initial Scores Above Median				Initial Scores Below Median			
	Tutees		Controls		Tutees		Controls	
Schools	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)
Pitts	5	(0.80)	11	(1.36)	7	1.00	5	1.80
Slater	7	(2.58)	8	(0.75)	9	0.33	7	0.29
Toomer	6	(2.00)	9	(2.33)	12	(0.83)	9	(0.89)
Carter	14	(1.28)	18	0.33	8	(0.25)	7	(0.57)
Hubert	8	(0.88)	7	0.90	2	(0.50)	6	(0.17)
Overall	40	(1.48)	53	(0.57)	38	(0.08)	34	(0.06)

TABLE 12

MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN SCHOOL ATTITUDE SCORES FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SEX

	Initial Scores Above Median				Initial Scores Below Median			
	Tutees		Controls		Tutees		Controls	
	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)
Males	25	(0.02)	23	0.14	7	0.26	13	0.45
Females	18	(0.18)	22	(0.44)	28	0.15	31	0.04
Overall	43	(0.09)	45	(0.14)	35	0.17	44	0.16

TABLE 13

MEAN GAIN (LOSS) IN SCHOOL ATTITUDE SCORES FOR TUTEES AND THEIR CONTROLS BY SCHOOLS

	Initial Scores Above Median				Initial Scores Below Median			
	Tutees		Controls		Tutees		Controls	
Schools	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)	N	Gain(loss)
Pitts	8	(0.39)	9	(0.53)	3	0.24	8	0.28
Slater	13	(0.28)	5	(0.19)	4	0.54	8	0.02
Toomer	7	(0.07)	15	(0.02)	12	0.14	4	0.09
Carter	9	0.34	9	0.16	13	0.17	17	0.34
Hubert	6	0.07	7	(0.27)	3	(0.31)	7	(0.17)
Overall	43	(0.09)	45	(0.14)	35	0.17	44	0.16

differences among schools and no school for which tutees changed much more than controls.

C. Reading Achievement

All 4th and 5th grade pupils in the Atlanta Public School System received the Metropolitan Achievement Test in May, 1970. The evaluation team administered the reading portions of this test to tutees and controls in the six schools during the last week of the tutoring program in order to assess changes in reading skills. The mean pretest and posttest grade equivalents are presented in Table 14 for the tutees and controls in each grade. The data in Table 14 are presented in order to show the reading levels of the pupils tested. Two items are worthy of note. First, 4th grade tutees scored higher on the pretest than all other groups except 5th grade controls and 5th grade controls scored over 1 grade level above 5th grade tutees both before and after the tutoring project.

Statistical analyses of the achievement gains yielded only one significant effect. Overall, fifth grade pupils gained more over the pretest, posttest interval than 4th grade pupils, $F(1,93) = 13.96$, $p < .01$. The tutoring experience produced little noticeable effect on the reading skills of the tutees over the regular classroom setting.

General Summary

In summary, the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program produced the following changes in tutees and tutors.

After participating in the program, the tutors in general demonstrated increased confidence in academic and self worth areas with the male showing a larger gain than the females. The tutors also indicated an increase in their willingness to accept credit for positive consequences of academically related behavior.

The female tutees showed an increase in their willingness to accept responsibility for academic successes while the male tutees were less likely to accept this responsibility. The program had a slightly detrimental effect on the attitude toward school of female tutees, while the school attitude of the male tutees deteriorated over the tutoring interval but to a lesser degree than the attitudes of their controls.

TABLE 14

MEAN PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES (IN GRADE EQUIVALENTS) FOR TUTEES ON THE READING SUBTEST OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Grade	Tutees			Controls		
	N	Pretest	Posttest	N	Pretest	Posttest
4	47	3.57	3.23	31	2.67	2.68
5	10	3.36	3.48	19	4.78	4.96

VI. EVALUATION OF PROGRAM BY PROJECT STAFF AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

At the end of the tutoring program, evaluation forms were distributed to the principals and center leaders of the participating schools as well as to those teachers whose pupils were tutored. The evaluation form (see the Appendix) consisted of 10 items in a question format concerning the effects of the program on school attitude and performance of both tutors and tutees, the general realization of program objectives, and recommendation for continuance of the program. Each item could be assigned a score from 1 (Definitely No) to 5 (Definitely Yes). Although the forms were distributed within the schools by the center leaders, envelopes were provided to assure the privacy of the individual evaluations.

Mean scale values for each item are listed separately in Table 15 for the principals, teachers and center leaders. Investigation of these data indicates a positive response to the program by all evaluators. Looking at the relative differences, however, the teachers were less positive about the program than the principals or center leaders. On 6 of the 10 questions, the least positive mean rank was recorded by the teachers. The lowest mean scale values were accorded those questions which dealt with teacher-related activities, for example, item 4 (ability of the tutors to teach basic skills) and item 6 (changing attitude and performance of tutors).

In general, the principals were the most enthusiastic of the respondents, this enthusiasm being most apparent in their unanimous recommendation for continuation of the program (a mean score of 5.00).

The center leaders were relatively more negative about the planning and organization of the program (item 8). Several expressed in their comments the need for greater pre-program planning and structured support during the program. One center leader strongly believed that the many evaluation procedures seriously interrupted the smooth operation of the program.

It is interesting to note that the center leaders were most negative about item 3 and 7 relating to whether the program was detrimental or had negative effects. The fact that these items were negatively keyed (a high ranking representing a negative response) perhaps caused confusion in their response. Any other interpretation of these responses would not be consistent with their very positive ranking of items 1 and 6, relating to beneficial effects of the program.

TABLE 15

MEAN SCALE VALUES ON EVALUATION ITEMS FOR TEACHERS
PRINCIPALS, AND CENTER LEADERS

Item No.	Item	Mean Rank Teacher	N	Principal	N	Center Leader	N
1.	Beneficial effect of program on school	4.49	76	4.60	10	4.67	15
2.	Witnessed growth in tutees	4.12	75	4.40	10	4.53	15
3.	Program detrimental to tutees	1.36	75.	1.10	10	2.23	13
4.	Could the tutors teach skills	3.92	73	4.55	9	4.20	15
5.	Tutors affected tutees' school attitude	3.96	72	4.40	10	3.43	14
6.	Positive changes in behavior and attitude of tutors	3.53	73	4.30	10	4.60	15
7.	Negative changes in behavior and attitude of tutors	1.94	72	1.20	10	3.00	15
8.	Program well-planned and organized	4.17	76	4.22	9	3.67	15
9.	Accomplish program objectives	4.07	73	4.10	10	4.40	15
10.	Recommend continuance of program	4.66	76	5.00	10	4.93	15

VII. EVALUATION OF PROGRAM BY TUTORS

The evaluation form for the tutors (see the Appendix) consisted of 15 items. These items generally covered the same material described in the administrator's evaluation form. In addition, items were added to assess the adequacy of program materials, training, the tutors' perception of the importance of their job, the degree to which their program suggestions were considered, and their willingness to continue as tutors in the program.

Mean scale values for each item are listed separately by school in Table 16. Overall, tutors were very enthusiastic about the program, with 10 of the 13 positively keyed items having a mean scale value above 4.00.

The two areas that received relatively less positive ratings were related to pre-program training and the availability of program materials (item 6 and 7). These ratings are consistent with those of the center leaders regarding organization. Given the rushed implementation of program, these criticisms appear to be realistic and reasonable.

The most positive overall ratings by the tutors were on items 4 and 8, related to learning new things and the importance of their job -- two factors very much related to the program objectives. Somewhat inconsistent with these ratings is the relatively low rating given item 11 concerning the ability of the tutors to make program suggestions that would be considered. This latter item appears to be related to the responsibility objectives of the program, and it is possible that having responsibility in other areas of the program still enabled them to consider their role as important.

Looking at the rankings by school, there is a high degree of correspondence given the schools from item to item. This finding is in agreement with the data reported earlier on the tutors which reported no significant differences between schools.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECCOMMENDATIONS

Due to the brief tutoring interval, the detection of changes in pupil behavior was minimized. In spite of these facts, the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program succeeded in producing some significant but rather small changes in the participating pupils. The attitudes of both tutors and tutees were modified in a moderate but positive direction relative to control pupils

TABLE 16

TUTORS' EVALUATION OF PROGRAM

Items	Capitol Ave. N=10	Carter N=8	English Ave. N=10	Gideons N=8	Goldsmith N=7	Grant Park N=10	Hubert N=7	Pitts N=19	Slater N=8	Slaton N=9	Toomer N=10	Ware N=10	Wesley Ave. N=10	Totals N=126
1. Tutor again	4.60	4.25	4.90	4.13	4.67	4.80	4.71	4.79	4.38	3.89	3.80	4.40	4.70	4.49
2. Skill growth - tutors	4.50	4.13	4.20	4.38	4.57	4.30	4.00	4.00	4.13	3.78	4.10	4.40	4.00	4.17
3. School attitude - tutees	4.11	3.13	4.20	3.75	4.00	3.67	3.86	4.47	3.88	3.89	4.10	3.80	4.40	4.00
4. Learn new things - tutor	4.40	4.75	4.78	4.63	4.71	4.50	4.57	4.67	5.00	4.67	4.30	4.80	4.70	4.65
5. School attitude - tutor	4.20	4.38	4.80	4.38	4.57	4.30	4.57	4.58	4.00	4.00	3.80	4.30	4.50	4.35
6. Pre-program training	4.11	4.00	3.40	3.88	4.29	3.50	3.43	4.16	4.13	3.33	3.20	3.60	3.70	3.76
7. Program materials	3.30	3.50	4.60	3.88	3.57	3.30	3.29	3.74	4.25	3.00	2.40	4.30	3.30	3.58
8. Importance of job	4.70	5.00	4.60	4.63	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.68	4.88	4.56	4.20	4.70	4.70	4.66
9. Group leader's help	4.50	4.38	4.70	4.25	4.57	4.50	4.86	4.26	4.75	3.33	4.00	4.80	4.60	4.40
10. Cooperation of principal and teachers	4.60	4.25	4.40	4.00	4.71	4.33	4.29	4.50	4.50	4.13	3.90	4.50	4.60	4.37
11. Able to make suggestions	3.90	3.88	4.00	3.25	4.29	3.22	4.17	4.11	4.2[illegible]	4.00	4.22	4.00	3.80	3.93
12. Do something else	2.20	2.25	1.60	2.75	3.50	2.20	1.86	2.05	2.13	2.22	2.70	3.00	1.40	2.25
13. Continuance of program	4.80	4.63	4.90	4.75	4.43	4.70	4.86	4.79	4.75	4.56	4.50	4.30	3.20	4.56
14. Job too difficult	1.70	1.50	1.50	2.50	2.29	1.70	2.14	1.74	1.88	1.22	1.80	1.70	1.80	1.78
15. Recommend job to friend	4.70	4.25	4.90	4.13	4.86	4.60	4.57	4.68	4.25	4.33	3.90	4.50	3.20	4.39

over the tutoring interval. Based upon these facts and others presented previously, the evaluators believe that the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program has merit.

However, it is believed that several aspects of the program could be modified to increase considerably the impact of the tutoring experience on both tutees and tutors. The recommendations which follow are based upon the observations of the evaluation team and the helpful comments of the principals, project staff, teachers, and tutors:

A. In its present form, the Youth-Tutoring-Youth Program lacks structure. Neither the center leaders nor the tutors had a clear understanding of their specific functions. Both the center leaders and tutors ranked pre-training and organization questions below other items on their evaluation form, and a number of the participants commented on this problem. Additional comments were made concerning the difficulty of obtaining necessary materials for creating a relevant curriculum. The program would benefit from additional planning of the specific duties of center leaders and from a more detailed explanation to tutors of the specific academic changes expected in tutees. A tutor should be told exactly what skill to work on and be given some guidance concerning useful attacks on these skills. Only then can the tutor create a useful curriculum and determine whether he has accomplished his objective. Changes in tutor behavior would be maximized if clear cut objectives are reached and the tutor is aware of this fact. The project staff attempted to meet this objective by using the Newman Analysis Test and films. However, neither tutors nor center leaders received enough training to make these materials very useful. It is recommended, therefore, that future implementation of the tutoring program provide a more structured organization, more specific explanation of specific tutoring objectives, and more pre-training of tutors in order to make these objectives clear.

B. The observations of the evaluation team, their interviews with tutors and school personnel and the evaluations by tutors themselves, suggest that many of the tutors were not given much responsibility. In any program of this type, one of the understandably difficult tasks is to convince teachers and administrators

that underachieving pupils <u>can</u> significantly affect their own and other pupils ability to learn. This program was no exception. One result of this ambivalence towards the project goals was a change at several schools in the role of the tutor to that of educational aide. While the tutors possibly could be effective within this setting, too often they were not, and much of their time was spent just sitting in the classroom or performing clerical duties. The most negative comments by tutors arose out of just these situations. Clearly these arrangements should be avoided in future programs.

Another aspect in this refocusing of responsibility is more general in its implications than the above and is closely related to the earlier recommendations of more planning and structure for the program. The rationale here is that it is one thing to tell the tutors that now have the responsibility and the ability to teach others; it is quite another to provide the necessary guidance so that this new responsibility does not lead to frustration. The many periods of idleness observed on the part of tutors by the testing team may well be a symptom of this frustration.

It is recommended, therefore, that tutors be given more direct responsibility for the teaching of elementary pupils but that this responsibility be given within the context of a program with structure and planning designed to make the responsibility clear to tutors and the successful execution of the responsibility by the tutors likely.

C. Two aspects of the procedure for selecting tutors and tutees should be altered for future implementation of the program. First, the data indicate that male tutors made larger gains in attitude than the female tutors. In addition, male tutees appear to have been affected adversely by the present program. It is possible that male tutees did not improve because most of their tutors were female. The typical public school is female oriented and frequently difficult for the male as a result of this fact. For these two reasons, it is recommended that future Youth-Tutoring-Youth programs concentrate on the hiring of additional male tutors and that tutor-tutee pairs be matched by sex.

Second, there were several indications in the data that were supported by the project staff which suggest that many of the tutors and tutees selected for the program were some of the better pupils in their schools rather than underachievers as planned. While the better pupils may be helped somewhat by a program of this type, the data indicate that pupils scoring in the upper half of each test almost universally lost ground over the program interval while pupils scoring in the lower half of each test frequently gained substantially across the interval. For this reason, it is recommended that future programs make a more careful effort to select as participants those pupils who are not performing well on academic tasks and for whom this behavior appears to be related to motivational and self-concept problems -- essentially those pupils described in the program guidelines.

D. The project interval for the summer program was not of sufficient length to produce significant, permanent changes in the participants. Future Youth-Tutoring-Youth programs should be allowed to continue for at least one half year and preferably for the entire school year.

E. Finally, the administrative structure and functioning should have been more in tune with the program objectives so that: (1) the objectives can be pursued in an orderly manner and (2) the participants (both staff and pupils) can participate in a unity and knowledgeable manner. The objectives should be seriously and vigorously pursued in order to bring about the expected changes.

Cost for Educational Aides in Program

Each of the sixteen centers had an educational aide who was paid $2.34 an hour for six hours or a total of $14.04 each day. For five days each week this amounted to $70.20 per week. Since there were six weeks in the program, each aide received $421.20. For the sixteen aides, the total cost was $6,739.20.

REFERENCES

Crandall, Virginia C.; Katkovsky, Walter; and Crandall, Vaughn J. "Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcements in intellectual academic situations." Child Development, 1965, 36:91-109.

Fitt, A. B. "An experimental study of children's attitude to school in Auckland, New Zealand." British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 26:25-30.

APPENDIX

ABOUT MYSELF SCALE

Please print name clearly. Date_____

Name_____ Boy Girl
(First) (Last) (Circle One)

Name of School_____Grade_____

DIRECTIONS: Below are sixteen statements on which you are being asked to rate yourself. For each item circle one of the numbers (1-5) to the right, which best describes what you think your Present Ability is.

EXAMPLE

	MY ABILITY AT PRESENT IS				
	Very Great	Great	Aver-age	Not too Great	Some what Small
	5	4	3	(2)	1

A. To play ball.

This pupil felt that his present ability "to play ball" was not too great, so he circled (2) not too great.

	MY ABILITY AT PRESENT IS				
	Very Great	Great	Aver-age	Not too Great	Some what Small
A. To be a leader.	5	4	3	2	1
B. To work on my own.	5	4	3	2	1
C. To speak before the class.	5	4	3	2	1
D. To experss ideas in writing .	5	4	3	2	1
E. To think clearly.	5	4	3	2	1
F. My artistic ability.	5	4	3	2	1
G. My athletic ability.	5	4	3	2	1
H. My musical ability.	5	4	3	2	1
I. My acting ability.	5	4	3	2	1
J. My mechanical ability.	5	4	3	2	1
K. My ability to get along with others.	5	4	3	2	1
L. My self-confidence.	5	4	3	2	1
M. My appearance.	5	4	3	2	1
N. My eagerness to learn.	5	4	3	2	1
O. My physical health.	5	4	3	2	1
P. My imagination.	5	4	3	2	1

CRANDALL'S INTELLECTUAL ACHIEVEMENT RESPONSIBILITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Name_____

School_____

1. If a teacher passes you to the next grade, would it probably be
   _____a. because she liked you, or
   _____b. because of the work you did?

2. When you do well on a test at school, is it more likely to be
   _____a. because you studied for it, or
   _____b. because the test was especially easy?

3. When you have trouble understanding something in school, is it usually
   _____a. because the teacher didn't explain it clearly, or
   _____b. because you didn't listen carefully?

4. When you read a story and can't remember much of it, is it usually
   _____a. because the story wasn't well written, or
   _____b. because you weren't interested in the story?

5. Suppose your parents say you are doing well in school: Is this likely to happen
   _____a. because your school work is good, or
   _____b. because they are in a good mood?

6. Suppose you did better than usual in a subject at school. Would it probably happen
   _____a. because you tried harder, or
   _____b. because someone helped you?

7. When you lose at a game of cards or checkers, does it usually happen
   _____a. because the other player is good at the game, or
   _____b. because you don't play well?

8. Suppose a person doesn't think you are very bright or clever.
   _____a. can you make him change his mind if you try, or
   _____b. are there some people who will think you're not very bright no matter what you do?

9. If you solve a puzzle quickly, is it
   _____a. because it wasn't a very hard puzzle, or
   _____b. because you worked on it carefully?

10. If a boy or girl tells you that you are dumb, is it more likely that they say that
    _____a. because they are mad at you, or
    _____b. because what you did really wasn't very bright?

11. Suppose you study to become a teacher, scientist, or doctor and you fail. Do you think this would happen
_____a. because you didn't work hard enough, or
_____b. because you needed some help, and other people didn't give it to you?

12. When you learn something quickly in school, is it usually
_____a. because you paid close attention, or
_____b. because the teacher explained it clearly?

13. If a teacher says to you, "Your work is fine," is it
_____a. something teachers usually say to encourage pupils, or
_____b. because you did a good job?

14. When you find it hard to work arithmetic or math problems at school, is it
_____a. because you didn't study well enough before you tried them, or
_____b. because the teacher gave problems that were too hard?

15. When you forget something you heard in class, is it
_____a. because the teacher didn't explain it very well, or
_____b. because you didn't try very hard to remember?

16. Suppose you weren't sure about the answer to a question your teacher asked you, but your answer turned out to be right. Is it likely to happen
_____a. because she wasn't as particular as usual, or
_____b. because you gave the best answer you could think of?

17. When you read a story and remember most of it, is it usually
_____a. because you were interested in the story, or
_____b. because the story was well written?

18. If your parents tell you you're acting silly and not thinking clearly, is it more likely to be
_____a. because of something you did, or
_____b. because they happen to be feeling cranky?

19. When you don't do well on a test at school, is it
_____a. because the test was especially hard, or
_____b. because you didn't study for it?

20. When you win at a game of cards or checkers, does it happen
_____a. because you play real well, or
_____b. because the other person doesn't play well?

21. If people think you're bright or clever, is it
_____a. because they happen to like you, or
_____b. because you usually act that way?

22. If a teacher didn't pass you to the next grade, would it probably be
_____a. because she "had it in for you," or
_____b. because your school work wasn't good enough?

23. Suppose you don't do as well as usual in a subject at school. Would this probably happen
_____a. because you weren't as careful as usual, or
_____b. because somebody bothered you and kept you from working?

24. If a boy or girl tells you that you are bright, is it usually
_____a. because you thought up a good idea, or
_____b. because they like you?

25. Suppose you became a famous teacher, scientist or doctor. Do you think this would happen
_____a. because other people helped you when you needed it, or
_____b. because you worked very hard?

26. Suppose your parents say you aren't doing well in your school work. Is this likely to happen more
_____a. because your work isn't very good, or
_____b. because they are feeling cranky?

27. Suppose you are showing a friend how to play a game and he has trouble with it. Would this happen
_____a. because he wasn't able to understand how to play, or
_____b. because you couldn't explain it well?

28. When you find it easy to work arithmetic or math problems at school, is it usually
_____a. because the teacher gave you especially easy problems, or
_____b. because you studied your book well before you tried them?

29. When you remember something you heard in class, is it usually
_____a. because you tried hard to remember, or
_____b. because the teacher explained it well?

30. If you can't work a puzzle, is it more likely to happen
_____a. because you are not especially good at working puzzles, or
_____b. because the instructions weren't written clearly enough?

31. If your parents tell you that you are bright or clever, is it
_____a. because they are feeling good, or
_____b. because of something you did?

32. Suppose you are explaining how to play a game to a friend and he learns quickly. Would this happen more often
_____a. because you explained it well, or
_____b. because he was able to understand it?

33. Suppose you're not sure about the answer to a question your teacher asks you and the answer you give turns out to be wrong. Is it likely to happen
_____a. because she was more particular than usual, or
_____b. because you answered too quickly?

34. If a teacher says to you, "Try to do better," would it be

_____a. because this is something she might say to get pupils to try harder, or

_____b. because your work wasn't as good as usual?

FITT'S SCHOOL ATTITUDE TEST

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are some statements about school that have been made by boys and girls in the Atlanta schools. As you read each statement, think about how you feel about it. If you agree with the statement--that is, if it is something you have thought about or might say yourself--you should put a circle around the word "Yes" which appears next to the statement. If the statement is something you disagree with--that is, something you have not thought about or would not say yourself--you should put a circle around the word "No" which appears next to the statement. Do each of the statements in this same way.

This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Just answer each statement the way you honestly feel about these things. You do not have to put your name on the paper so feel free to express your true feelings.

Yes No 1. I like school better than anything else.

Yes No 2. I feel happy at school.

Yes No 3. If I had my way I would never go to school.

Yes No 4. I like everything about school.

Yes No 5. I like some things at school but do not like others.

Yes No 6. I hate school more than anything else.

Yes No 7. I suppose school is all right but I don't care much for it.

Yes No 8. We have to work too hard at school.

Yes No 9. We are lucky to have schools to go to.

Yes No 10. School is a waste of time.

Yes No 11. I would sooner work at home or somewhere else than at school.

Yes No 12. I like the games we have at school.

Yes No 13. I am glad when school is over.

Yes No 14. In school we learn a lot of things which are of no use.

Yes No 15. I like school because it keeps us out of mischief.

Yes No 16. I like school so much that I don't mind getting very tired there.

Yes No 17. I do not want to leave school.

Yes No 18. It is a pity we have to go to school.

Yes No 19. I enjoy every minute of school but am glad when the holidays come.

Yes No 20. I like to hear people saying nice things about school.

Yes No 21. I do not care about school work but I would not like all boys and girls to be like me.

Yes No 22. I thing life would be better if all the schools were closed.

Yes No 23. I like school when I am there, but I like the holidays better.

Yes No 24. I like school just a little.

Yes No 25. I like to go to school because I learn many new things there.

Yes No 26. There is too much work at school.

Yes No 27. I shall leave school as soon as I am allowed to.

Yes No 28. We do not have enough play at school.

Yes No 29. Sometimes I think going to school is good and sometimes I think if is useless.

Yes No 30. I think I am going to do better in my school work now than I did before.

Yes No 31. I think I might like to be a teacher someday.

Yes No 32. The principal of a school has a very important job.

Yes No 33. They should lower the age at which you can drop out of school.

INDEPENDENT READING, WRITING, AND RESEARCH ABILITY ANALYSIS

By Robert E. Newman, Syracuse University
(Copyright, 1968)

Date:__/__/__ Date:__/__/__ Date:__/__/__

BASIC READING WORDS (learn w/flashcards) "Read the first column of words on the reverse side of this sheet." __correct /50

SOUNDS OF LETTERS (learn by dictation--recognize exceptions) "What letter am I sounding?"

t	d	s (s or c OK)
l	m	j (j or g OK)
n	v	k (k or c OK)
b	w	g (g as in gone)
f	h	x (like ks)
p	z	

__correct /18

1-REGULAR CONSONANTS (learn w/word wheels) "What is the sound of each of these letters?"

b	l	x	n
k	r	v	h
d	m	p	s
l	c	j	f
	g	t	

__correct /17

4-REGULAR CONSONANT BLENDS (learn w/word wheels) "How do these sound?"

st	cl	sw
bl	gl	tw
pl	qu	str
tr	sp	spr
fr	sm	spl
fl	sn	

__correct /17

5-COMMON DIGRAPHS (learn w/word wh.) "How do these sound?"

wh		
ng	sh	ck
nk	ch	th

__correct /7

6-COMMON SYLLABLES (learn w/word wheels) "Read these parts of words"

ell	ent	est	ail	ight	ay
en	ain	ike	er	ill	tion
and	ter	ide	con	ock	ed
op	ell	ing	ick	ake	ile

__correct /24

COMMON VOWEL ELEMENTS (learn w/word wheels) "Read these nonsense words."

fay	eap	meer	taw	quoar
dee	kai	roat	mair	mout
moy	foi	kour		mear
roo	fow	maup		

__correct /17

8-BLENDING (learn w/word wheels) "First I'll read to you each part of each nonsense word. Then you put them together."

l ail
th ite
bl ail er
fr ick ter
sm ock tion
gr ay ent
tw ide
spl ot ing
fl im est
j ight ly

__correct /10

BASIC SPELLING WORDS (to be dictated. See reverse side of this sheet. __correct /50

10-LEGIBLE PRINTING OR WRITING (and)
11-COMMUNICATIVE PRINTING OR WRITING
(Attach periodic mples of written work to is sheet.)

_____ IS ABLE TO:

(not at all) (H.S. "A" senior)

32. WRITE WITH HONEST UNIQUE FLAVOR
31. WRITE WITH GOOD ORGANIZATION
30. USE WORDS CORRECTLY AND WITH IMAGINATION
29. UNDERSTAND THE IDEAS HE IS WRITING
28. WRITE WITH STANDARD PUNCTUATION
27. WRITE WITH STANDARD USAGE
26. SPELL WHAT HE WANTS TO WRITE
25. WRITE LEGIBLY AND QUICKLY
24. (Composite) NARROW AND CLARIFY QUESTIONS
23. MAKE AN INITIAL RESEARCH BIBLIOGRAPHY
22. USE WHO'S WHO AND OTHER BIOG. REF. BOOKS
21. USE WORLD ALMANAC AND OTHER YEARBOOKS
20. USE MAPS, GLOBES, AND ATLASES
19. TAKE NOTES
18. SCAN AND SKIM TO FIND INFORMATION
17. USE PARTS OF A BOOK
16. LOCATE BOOKS USING CATALOG & CALL NUMBERS
15. USE ENCYCLOPEDIA
14. USE AN INDEX
13. USE ENGLISH LANGUAGE DICTIONARY
12. LOCATE AN ALPHABETICALLY ORGANIZED LISTING
11. print or write communicatively
10. print or write legibly
9. spell appx. 65% words 6th graders write
8. blend elements
7. decode common vowel elements
6. decode common syllables
5. decode common digraphs
4. decode regular consonant blends
3. decode regular consonents
2. recognize consonants from sounds
1. read basic words

THE READING LADDER

(informal oral-silent reading assessments)

maximum oral

maximum silent

1-BASIC READING WORDS Ask child to read the longest column only. The balance of the list is included as a teaching resource.

	a	fall	man	stop
	about	far	many	table
	after	fast	may	tell
	again	find	morning	ten
	all	first	Mr.	thank
	always	fly	must	that
	am	four	my	the
an	and	from	myself	them
blue	any	full	never	then
come	are	funny	new	there
good	as	gave	night	these
I	ask	get	not	this
like	at	give	now	those
me	ate	girl	off	three
red	away	go	old	today
so	baby	going	on	together
you	back	got	once	too
black	be	green	one	tree
did	bad	grow	open	try
for	because	had	or	two
him	been	happy	out	up
no	before	have	over	us
put	better	he	own	use
some	big	help	party	very
two	both	her	play	walk
yellow	boy	here	please	warm
but	bring	his	pretty	was
five	brown	hold	pull	wash
goes	buy	hot	ran	water
has	by	house	read	way
made	call	hurt	ride	we
of	came	if	right	well
our	can	in	round	went
sing	car	into	run	were
upon	carry	is	said	when
your	clean	it	saw	where
around	cold	its	say	which
best	cowboy	jump	see	white
found	cut	just	seven	who
how	do	keep	shall	why
much	does	kind	she	will
only	done	know	show	wish
take	don't	let	sit	work
they	down	little	six	would
under	draw	live	sleep	yes
with	eat	long	small	
fish	eight	look	soon	
could	every	make	start	
drink				
light				
pick				
their				
think				
want				
what				
write				
laugh				

__correct
50

2-BASIC SPELLING WORDS Dictate underlined words only. Total list is approximately 65% of words sixth graders write.*

made	here	too	man	when
teacher	bring	are	than	play
about	what	must	name	daddy
every	please	can	he	by
your	dear	last	write	grade
but	come	who	summer	best
take	big	three	coming	she
love	got	bed	book	run
eat	were	girl	also	two
until	see	our	first	no
along	was	country	then	old
find	my	great	always	place
me	now	where	soon	large
the	one	away	and	go
down	put	next	found	fun
am	just	only	most	gave
for	glad	way	thing	time
much	before	told	do	morning
things	did	ball	let	these
doll	some	well	so	have
little	would	hope	work	tree
should	as	read	has	all
wish	children	say	in	few
has	tell	him	took	many
if	lot	black	around	that
us	make	to	think	never
any	after	pretty	car	heard
from	each	day	long	year
came	sure	called	white	look
is	you	better	through	right
will	brother	good	been	there
thought	over	which	give	milk
because	his	said	out	them
getting	fine	very	cold	more
other	men	night	her	started
could	their	of	not	don't
help	five	people	baby	another
letter	door	room	nice	four
asked	an	it	off	
new	friend	get	we	
once	mother	close	town	
water	they	while	be	
today	dog	like	went	
back	live	didn't	house	
week	snow	into	red	
home	with	this	school	
ran	happy	again	how	
saw	I'm	father	boy	

__correct
50

*These words were selected from research summarized and categorized by Gertrude Hildreth in TEACHING SPELLING (New York: Henry Holt, 1955), pp. 311-342.

YOUTH TUTORING YOUTH PROGRAM
Evaluation Form for Principals, Teachers, and Group Leaders

Name:_____ Position:_____

School:_____

For each of the questions listed below, please indicate your reaction by encircling the number in which best represents your opinion. At the bottom of the page, please feel free to comment further on any of the questions or on any aspect of the Youth Tutoring Youth Program which will help in its constructive evaluation. Your frank opinions will be appreciated. Since no one else at your school will need to see this form when it is completed, please put it in the envelope provided and <u>seal</u> it.

The numbers stand for the following expression of opinion:	Definitely Yes 5	Generally Yes 4	Neutral or No Effect 3	Generally No 2	Definitely No 1

* *

1. Do you feel that the tutoring program has had a beneficial effect on the school program as a whole? 5 4 3 2 1

2 Have you witnessed growth in any of the students being tutored? 5 4 3 2 1

3. Has the program been detrimental to any student? 5 4 3 2 1

4. Do you feel that the tutors were able to effectively teach the children basic skills? 5 4 3 2 1

5. Do you think the tutors positively affected the attitudes toward school of their tutees? 5 4 3 2 1

6. Did you witness any positive changes in the attitude and behavior of the tutors? 5 4 3 2 1

7. Did you witness any negative changes with any of the tutors? 5 4 3 2 1

8. Do you think the program was well-planned and executed? 5 4 3 2 1

9. Do you think the objectives of the program were accomplished? 5 4 3 2 1

10. Would you recommend that a program of this type be continued in the Atlanta Public Schools? 5 4 3 2 1

Additional Comments (use other side of paper if additional space is needed):

YOUTH TRAINING YOUTH PROGRAM
Evaluation Form for Tutors

Name:_____ School:_____

For each of the questions listed below, please indicate your reaction by encircling the number which best represents your opinion. At the bottom of the page, please feel free to comment further on any of the questions or on aspect of the Youth Tutoring Program which will help in its constructive evaluation. Your frank opinions will be appreciated. Since no one else at your school will need to see this form when it is completed, please put it in the envelope provided and seal it.

The numbers stand for the following expression of opinion:	Definitely Yes 5	Generally Yes 4	Neutral or No Effect 3	Generally No 2	Definitely No 1

* *

1	If you had a chance to be a tutor again in the same kind of program, would you do it?	5 4 3 2 1
2	Did you see any positive growth in basic skills with any of your tutees?	5 4 3 2 1
3	Did you see an improved attitude towards school with any of your tutees?	5 4 3 2 1
4	Do you feel that you have learned new things by being a tutor?	5 4 3 2 1
5	Has your attitude towards school improved?	5 4 3 2 1
6	Do you think you had enough training before you began to tutor?	5 4 3 2 1
7	Do you feel that you had enough materials to work with?	5 4 3 2 1
8	Do you feel that you had an <u>important</u> job to do?	5 4 3 2 1
9	Do you think your group leader gave you enough assistance and guidance?	5 4 3 2 1
10	Do you feel that you had the cooperation of the teachers & principal with the program?	5 4 3 2 1
11	Did you feel that you could make suggestions about the program and and that they would be listened to?	5 4 3 2 1
12	Do you feel your time could have been better spent doing something else this summer?	5 4 3 2 1
13	Would you recommend that this program be continued in the Atlanta Public Schools?	5 4 3 2 1
14	Did you feel that the job was too difficult or demanding?	5 4 3 2 1
15	Would you recommend this job to your best friend?	5 4 3 2 1

Additional Comments (use other side of paper if additional space is needed):